

KeizerOpinion

KEIZERTIMES.COM

Anti-Muslim rhetoric profits the enemy

By MICHAEL GERSON

After the Brussels murders, and the Paris murders, and the San Bernardino murders and dozens of previous, tragic iterations of innocent blood on the sidewalk, the two leading Republican candidates for president propose to finally get tough on terrorism.

In Ted Cruz's view, America is "voluntarily surrendering to the enemy to show how progressive and enlightened we are." He would have us "carpet bomb" the Islamic State and "patrol and secure Muslim neighborhoods before they become radicalized" here at home.

"Look," says Donald Trump, "we're having problems with the Muslims." He would "knock the hell out of ISIS," close the border to Muslim immigrants "until we figure out what's going on," "do a lot more waterboarding," and purposely target the families of terrorists (at least until he seemed to backpedal).

The argument advanced by Cruz

and Trump is straightforward. Out of an excess of political correctness, America has not recognized and confronted the Islamic nature and motivation of terrorism.

This, according to the candidates, has hamstrung U.S. law enforcement, counterterrorism and border-control efforts, which should include the heightened scrutiny of Muslims. The migration of Muslims presents a particular, Trojan-horse threat, illustrated by the European experience of segregation and radicalization. "This all happened," argues Trump, "because frankly there is no assimilation."

The emotional urgency of the Republican front-runners is understandable, particularly in light of President Obama's underreaction—a statement about the Brussels attacks of less than a minute, followed by some Cuban baseball. The terrorists — who worship death, fashion bombs out of young men and women and

exploit Islam for totalitarian political purposes—deserve our outrage.

But here is the problem. Rhetoric that targets "the Muslims" and singles out Americans for suspicion based on nothing more than their faith seriously complicates the war against terrorism, for these reasons:

(1) Anti-Muslim rhetoric strains relations with Sunni Muslim countries, which we are trying to convince to do more to combat the Islamic State. "The leadership of these countries," former acting CIA director Mike Morell told me, "understand American politics enough to know that, for now, this is just rhetoric. But their publics do not get that. And it is the perception that acts to limit what these nations can do overtly to support the U.S."

(2) It amplifies Islamic State propaganda that the West is conducting a religious war against the "caliphate," which is a source of terrorist morale. "It certainly feeds extremist recruitment," says Morell, "but it also makes even moderate Muslims wonder if the extremists may be right."

(3) Anti-Muslim rhetoric needlessly disrupts relationships with American Muslim communities that are often the first to recognize and report radicalization in their midst. "From the perspective of American Muslims," according to former national security adviser Stephen Hadley, "the rhetoric creates a sense of alienation from their fellow citizens and makes them more susceptible to the [Islamic State] argument that they have no real place in American society — and that their true 'home' is in the caliphate."

In a sense, Trump is right. Assimilation is the key. But by what possible theory of assimilation should America declare Islam to be inconsistent with its ideals?

If our objective were to replicate Europe's dangerous social segregation, what would we do? Maybe conduct the war against terrorism through war crimes; screen for Muslims at the airport (by some mechanism that still escapes me); declare the Muslim faith a target of heightened suspicion; occupy Muslim neighborhoods with a heavy-

handed police presence; encourage anti-Muslim attitudes that could easily devolve into hate crimes and violence.

It is no mystery how resentful people become resentful. "This ugly rhetoric risks stoking the kind of alienation here that we have seen in some European Muslim communities," former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff told me.

There is room to strengthen the U.S. immigration system in light of terrorist threats — to tighten the visa and passenger-list systems, and ensure FBI access to information on the smartphones of terrorists. "But let's not forget [that] what makes us vulnerable," says Peter Feaver, a former adviser at the National Security Council, "is not the presence of immigrants in our midst. Rather what makes us vulnerable is the degree of alienation within any community, including immigrants."

Alienating Muslim allies, scapegoating Muslim citizens and resigning ourselves to a global religious conflict would grant the terrorists a victory without a battle. Which makes Trump and Cruz either quite cynical or alarmingly oblivious.

(Washington Post Writers Group)

Would The Donald govern like Arnold?

By DEBRA J. SAUNDERS

They're both iconic figures in American culture who are known by their first names. California's former governor is Arnold. The GOP presidential front-runner is The Donald. We Californians who lived through Arnold's two terms in the governor's office have watched The Donald's presidential campaign unfold with a sense of déjà vu.

Donald Trump starred in the TV show "Celebrity Apprentice." Arnold Schwarzenegger will replace him. Both men can boast supsize personalities and bulging bank accounts. Both bombasts ran for a top office with no political experience whatsoever — which turned out to be a plus, as they tapped into a tidal

wave of voter resentment. Both are more pragmatic than ideological.

Schwarzenegger's supporters thought he could not win a GOP primary — and he didn't have to, because he ran and won in California's free-for-all recall election of 2003. Trump's front-runner status in the 2016 primary — also the beneficiary of a crowded field — likewise has confounded the professional political class.

Over the past week, I talked to four former Schwarzenegger aides (only two of whom would say anything on the record) about what Trump and Schwarzenegger have in common, how they are different and

what Schwarzenegger's tenure might tell us about a Trump presidency should he win in November.

One former adviser, Adam Mendelsohn, who wanted nothing to do with a negative assessment of Schwarzenegger's time in office, told me he sees "absolutely no similarity between the two" men. All appreciated that the biggest difference is that

Trump is running for president — as a naturalized citizen, the Austrian Oak is not eligible to be president under the Constitution — and there should be a higher bar for the man who wants to have his hand on the nuclear button.

Looking back, Schwarzenegger's first term was highly successful in many ways.

True to a campaign promise, Schwarzenegger renegotiated terms with major tribal casinos, which netted state coffers a \$1 billion windfall. He also ushered much-needed workers' compensation reform through a reluctant Legislature by threatening to put a measure on the ballot if Sacramento did not pass a bill.

Later, the Governor overreached

when he placed four different ballot measures before voters. When Californians rejected all four, Schwarzenegger's aura of invincibility crumbled.

Many had feared that if Schwarzenegger failed to live up to his promise, it would be because he needed to be liked. And that's exactly what happened. Schwarzenegger told voters he heard their message and promised to work with the Legislature. That signaled a lurch to the left. He won re-election. In term two, Schwarzenegger enacted a landmark law to curb greenhouse gases, a move very popular among Democrats. On the way out the door, Schwarzenegger issued a pardon that shaved nine years off a 16-year term for voluntary manslaughter, which benefited the former Assembly speaker's son.

Schwarzenegger entered politics with the sort of great American success story that only an immigrant can tell. He dreamed of becoming an American, and he did. He worked hard. His belief in the free market steered him to the GOP. He worshipped conservative economist Milton Friedman. He had tried to push through meaningful pension

reform and pare back state spending. But saddled with a Legislature loaded with Democrats, even with his sharp political instincts, he did not succeed. When conservative political neophytes fail, their path to salvation is to list left. And there he stayed.

Trump has fewer conservative credentials. He supports the use of eminent domain to seize property for private development. He has lavished money on Democratic candidates. If he should win the White House and find himself flailing in the polls, then he would know where to go.

It is instructive to note that for all they have in common, Schwarzenegger chose to endorse not Trump but Ohio Gov. John Kasich. Schwarzenegger spokesman Daniel Ketchell told me it's because Kasich knows how to work in the center.

Former Schwarzenegger aide Sean Walsh, however, thinks Schwarzenegger chose Kasich over Trump precisely because Trump is too much like Schwarzenegger. Let me add another trait: The Donald and Arnold share: They're both salesmen first. And salesmen usually aren't around when you need to fix the refrigerator.

(Creators Syndicate)

Build a WinCo here and we will come

letters

To the Editor:

My husband and I just read the "One Grocery Store" article in the *Keizertimes* of March 18.

I am 70 years old and my husband is 89 years old. I have lived in Keizer since 1970. When we first moved to Keizer, Orcutt's was open, and we shopped there without regard to prices, because we liked the people and the store was convenient to get to. After Orcutt's closed, we shopped around, and discovered that we regularly paid less, overall, even with the cost of travel, at what is now WinCo.

When they talked about building Keizer Station, the only reason either I or my husband really cared was that we read that WinCo would most likely be putting in a store there. So we voted for Keizer Station in the public input surveys. Then station neighbors and the Roth family made a stink, and WinCo was refused entry. We rarely shop at Keizer Station, but we do drive by there once or twice a month on our way to the freeway, in order to go to the WinCo off of Mission Street/Highway 22.

I don't know how many times (many!) I've run into Keizer neighbors and friends at WinCo, and we almost always comment to one another that we heartily wish there were a WinCo in Keizer, so we could shop there and not travel so far. It would cost less, take less time and be more convenient and practical all the way around. But I have asked at WinCo several times over

the years why they don't build in Keizer, and they always tell me WinCo owns property by Keizer Station, but Keizer still won't allow us to build on it.

First we had kids, and every dollar counted. Then there were a few years when the prices weren't so important, but the people were nice and we had built the habit. Now we live on Social Security, food stamps and food boxes from a local food pantry, and every dollar — indeed, every cent — counts. And by making a point of traveling all the way to WinCo only once or twice a month, even with the recent very high gas prices, we have continued to spend less, overall, when we shop at WinCo. If we have to buy things in between, we usually go to Fred Meyer, for the same reason—it tends to be less expensive and has quicker checkout service than Safeway.

We don't use Facebook — it is a time-waster. And we have never belonged to the board or agency or commission that decided what stores to include and what stores to exclude from Keizer Station. But we have always wanted a WinCo in Keizer, and still do. I don't care if it's at Keizer Station, or where Roth's or Albertsons were, or someplace else in the greater Keizer area. If WinCo builds in (or closer to) Keizer, that's where we'll shop. That's where most of us older, money-strapped Keizer residents will shop — or the younger ones with kids and tight budgets, for that matter.

You want to keep us shopping in Keizer? Let WinCo open a store in Keizer!

**Bahbi Stanton
Keizer**

other views

I've a hunch in this season of political campaigning, that many an American seeks sanity from the storm of hyperbole that's out there every day now. A lot of concern has to do with the rather open-ended, undefined or sketchy, difficult-to-imagine-coming-to-fruiton promises that some of those who want to be president are throwing out there for what, it's surmised, may be considered by some as virtually impossible in the present-day American political climate.

One college economics professor in Oregon, Kimberly Clousing at Reed, offers some thinking (*The Sunday Oregonian*, March 20) on what may be best characterized by Bernie Sanders and Donald J. Trump as their skepticism and outright hostility regarding the influence of foreign competition on the U.S. economy. She reminds us that both of them have vowed to tear up existing trade agreements, stop illegal immigration by a wall, table new international initiatives, bring China to greatly improved deals with us and halt corporate flight to Mexico and elsewhere overseas.

American voters have legitimate concerns over wage stagnation and income inequality. Yet, Clousing says, Sanders and Trump are proposing destructive solutions that will cause greater harm than good right here in Oregon and most likely more income stagnation for most workers who earn wages below that minority often referred to as the 1 percent, although there are undoubtedly many more than 1 percent who've managed to make more money while the so-called middle class have been frozen in place or lost their livelihoods to reductions in workforce or relocation to Mexico, etc.

Advancing technology's impact is one of the major contributors to what's happening here, where many jobs have been replaced with automated processes and computers. Yet, few if any of us are advocating for getting rid of computers as they have become mainly irreplaceable in our daily lives. Then, too, computers aid and assist skilled work-

ers in what they can do, produce and earn in wages. They also streamline and aid all who use them in personal communications and business ventures.

Clousing reminds us too that trade, similar to the ubiquitous computer, makes for winners and losers: workers that made imported goods may be harmed while workers in industries that export can benefit. Also, consumers can be winners by way of price reductions in many consumer products. Further, foreign competition means that domestic businesses are held back from monopoly status while economic advantages elsewhere can help to secure a more stable world by reducing poverty conditions. Additionally, establishing and maintaining an international community can result in building bridges rather than walls.

What's argued by Clousing is that the entire nation benefits from trade. When nations get out of line, most often these days, sanctions are used instead of war, in an effort to bring them back to responsible world citizenship. Meanwhile, when we practice protectionism as apparently advocated by Sanders and Trump, by denying others access to our consumer markets, these steps sometimes — too often, in fact — result in a form of self-sanctioning, bringing harm to ourselves.

Although there's no proof of benefit, Sanders and Trump want to give away the benefits from trade, presuming that reduced imports will benefit American workers. Clousing believes that Oregon's Intel, Nike and other industries here as well as those workers in vineyards, hazelnut farms and many an agricultural enterprise would be harmed by the loss of export activity. Meanwhile, it's very doubtful that former manufacturing jobs and many a job now done by automated systems and office efficiencies, among multiple others, will come

gene h. mcintyre

back under any grand design that stops the import-export activity.

As a remedy for what ails us, Clousing advocates for targeted income redistribution, the likes of which would include stronger underpinnings for earned income tax credit along with increased tax liabilities for those who have benefited from the economic gains and profits during the last several years. More spending, too, on rebuilding our infrastructure and enhancing educational opportunities, not just college learning opportunities but also vocational-technical learning, will ensure that Oregon and the U.S. is a highly desirable place to remain in business in this new century.

A long and hard look at the present time reveals that a lot of Americans are hurt by the changes underway. The American who views the good life as exclusively with those employed in large corporations, the banks and Wall Street may view himself as a loser who can only stand and watch the world go by. These men and women, often nowadays, want a savior of sorts, like a Trump or Sanders, who promise to shake things up big-time to increase their individual advantages.

So, to which pundit, professor or politician does a person turn? All that's going on may present what appear to be insurmountable challenges. Whatever the case, all things considered, it's believed that the best advantage for every American continues, as has been true for some time, the acquiring of an education, including related training, academically or vocational-technical, with help from career counseling, readily available in high schools and community colleges, that promises a job with a future, a living wage and the chance to survive in Oregon or elsewhere in a constantly changing world. In other words, you're mainly on your own with whatever local help you can access.

(Gene H. McIntyre's column appears weekly in the *Keizertimes*.)

Keizertimes

Wheatland Publishing Corp. • 142 Chemawa Road N. • Keizer, Oregon 97303
phone: 503.390.1051 • web: www.keizertimes.com • email: kt@keizertimes.com



EDITOR & PUBLISHER
Lyndon Zaltz
publisher@keizertimes.com

NEWS EDITOR
Craig Murphy
editor@keizertimes.com

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Eric A. Howard
news@keizertimes.com

ADVERTISING
Paula Moseley
advertising@keizertimes.com

PRODUCTION MANAGER
Andrew Jackson
graphics@keizertimes.com

LEGAL NOTICES
legals@keizertimes.com

BUSINESS MANAGER
Laurie Painter
billing@keizertimes.com

RECEPTION
Lori Beyeler

SUBSCRIPTIONS
One year:
\$25 in Marion County,
\$33 outside Marion County,
\$45 outside Oregon

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
Publication No: USPS 679-430

POSTMASTER
Send address changes to:
Keizertimes Circulation
142 Chemawa Road N.
Keizer, OR 97303

Periodical postage paid at
Salem, Oregon

facebook

facebook.com/keizertimes

twitter

twitter.com/keizertimes